REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 23-29 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CTRC (reference V on PTO-892 mailed 31 August 2007), hereinafter "CTRC" in view of Taylor (see PTO-892, mailed 22 August 2006 and 31 August 2007 and PTO-892 mailed with the current Office Action), hereinafter "Taylor", and Coulouris (see PTO-892 mailed with the current office action), hereinafter "Coulouris". Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CTRC in view of Taylor and Coulouris as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lymer et al., U.S. Patent No 6,230, 117 B1, hereinafter "Lymer". Claims 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,347, 342, hereinafter "Marcos", in view of CTRC, Taylor and Coulouris. Applicants submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment to the claims.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On February 7, 2008, Examiner Nathan Price and Applicants' representatives, Mr. Kenneth Eiferman and Mr. Peter Hernandez, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Price agreed that the claim amendments herein appeared to overcome all rejections of record.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the office action it was noted that "based on the conversions of claim 1, it is not clear if all of the requests and replies are transmitted using the same protocol. Furthermore, it is not clear if the first system can communicate according to the second network protocol. If not, then it is not clear how the first request is received from the first system (claim 1)".

Firstly, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "generating at" instead of "receiving from" in order to clarify that the first system is generating the first request that is

directed to the second system. Independent claim 32 has been amended in similar fashion to claim 1 in order to clarify the claim language.

Claim 10 has been amended in view of the Examiner's comments and as amended is believed to be in condition to overcome the noted rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 23-29 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CTRC in view of Taylor and Coulouris.

Indpendent claim 1, 23 and 32 have been amended to recite in part that *"the HIP system further including a first object to read conversion information from a file that explains how to translate data types from the first system to the second system to a particular flow control and a second object to access end-to-end mapping information from the file to a particular flow control"*. Support for this amendment can be found in for example paragraph [0082] in which an IAdmin object 662 and an IReadlib object 664 are disclosed.

The cited CTRC reference which discloses a Cisco Transaction Connection (CTRC) for connecting desktops to data, nor the Taylor reference which describes SNA and TCP/IP integration, nor the Coulouris reference that discusses distributed systems taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest a HIP system that includes "a first object to read conversion information from a file that explains how to translate data types from the first system to the second system to a particular flow control and a second object to access end-to-end mapping information from the file to a particular flow control". The first and second objects recited in the added claim limitations are used by components of the HIP system to access the mapping information that has been set up to enable two systems to interoperate with each other. These objects are referred to as IAdmin object and the IReadlib object in paragraph [0082] of the specification.

Independent claim 23 has been amended to also recite that the HIP system further includes:

"*first and second conversion components, the first conversion component handling conversion issues related to aggregate data types and the second conversion component handling conversions issues related to primitive data types*". Support for this amendment can be found in for example paragraph [0078] and paragraph [0070] found in the specification of the current application. The cited references also fail to teach or suggest the newly added first and second conversion components as recited in independent claim 23.

Given that the cited references taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest such a file and such first and second objects as currently recited in independent claim 1, 23 and 32 it is believed that these claims are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 24-29 and 33-36 are also believed to be in condition for allowance given that they add further nonobvious limitations to their respective base claims. Claim 7 which stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CTRC in view of Taylor and Coulouris as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lymer is also believed to be in condition for allowance given that it also depends on claim 1.

Claims 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcos et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,347, 342, hereinafter "Marcos", in view of CTRC, Taylor and Coulouris. Claim 14 has been amended in similar fashion to claim 1 and as such it along with its dependent claims 15-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the cited references. The cited Marcos reference which describes a method and apparatus for dynamically brokering objects messages among object models along with the other cited references mentioned above fail to teach or suggest a method of enabling a first software object in a first system to call a second software object in a second system as now recited in claim 14.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: February 14, 2008   /Kenneth R. Eiferman/
                                                            Kenneth R. Eiferman
                                                            Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439